

REMARKS

Introductory Comments:

Claims 1-25 were examined in the Office Action dated May 16, 2006.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,279,854 to Kendall *et al.* (Kendall) and U.S. Patent No. 4,863,316 to Gianella *et al.* (Gianella).

Claims 3, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kendall in view of Gianella and U.S. Patent No. 4,561,808 to Spaulding *et al.* (Spaulding).

Claims 8, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kendall in view of Spaulding.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kendall in view of Spaulding and Gianella.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kendall in view of Gianella and U.S. Patent No. 5,727,732 to Stein.

Claims 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as lacking antecedent basis.

Claims 6 and 7 were said to be allowable if written in independent form.

Claim 15-25 were allowable.

SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-14 have been canceled without prejudice.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added by way of this amendment and the entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Addressing the Examiner's Rejections

Rejections of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kendall in view of Spaulding. The rejection is made moot by the cancellation of the claims. However, applicants state this rejection is improper since anticipation rejection cannot be made by using a combination of references.

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kendall in view of Gianella and Stein. The rejection is made moot by the cancellation of the claim. However, applicants state this rejection is improper since anticipation rejection cannot be made by using a combination of references.

Rejections of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

(a) The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kendall in view of Gianella. The rejection is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

(b) The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kendall in view of Gianella and Spaulding. The rejection is made moot by the cancellation of the claims.

(c) The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kendall in view of Gianella and Stein. The rejection is made moot by the cancellation of the claim.

Rejections of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as lacking antecedent basis. The rejection is made moot by the cancellation of the claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims define an invention that is patentable over the art, and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' representative at (650) 335-7818.

Respectfully submitted,
Harutyunyan et al.

Dated: June 27/2006

By: Narinder S. Banait
Narinder S. Banait, Reg. No.: 43,482
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7818
Fax.: (650) 938-5200